

**REMARKS**

The Office Action in the above-identified application has been carefully considered and this amendment has been presented to place this application in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 7, and 9-12 are in the present application. It is submitted that these claims were patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The changes to the claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. sections 101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled. Claims 6 and 8 are canceled. Claims 9-12 are added.

Claim 1 was objected to because of an informality. Applicant has amended the claim in accordance with the Examiner's comment. Accordingly, Applicant believes this rejection has been overcome.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Walker et al. (U.S. Patent 5,862,223) However, in the present invention, a first user (e.g. a customer) can demand a request list of information requests. The "request list includes a mark which expresses the existence of service information." (Claims 1 and 7) In other words, by viewing the mark corresponding to each information request, the user can readily determine whether the request has already been answered (i.e. serviced); in which case, service information answering the

request already exists. This "mark" limitation is supported on page 10 of the specification, and shown in Figure 5. Although Walker does disclose an expert system which includes some of the features of the present invention, Walker does not disclose an analogous "mark" feature to indicate whether a request has already been serviced. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Walker fails to anticipate the present invention and the rejected claims should now be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application as now presented is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

No additional fees are deemed to be required for the filing of this amendment, but if such are, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Darren M. Simon  
Reg. No. 47,946  
(212) 588-0800